

full or part time, however, nothing was binding on the administration. They had the free will to do whatever they wanted to, but their plan was to keep 23 offices of the 46 open either part or full time. I think the second reason that she vetoed the issue was the more important one and I would like to point out that it was not on the basis of the issue itself. My feeling is that she is not opposed to the addition back of \$100,000 in the budget for this...the enactment of 392. She is more opposed to the fact that she wanted to send a message, and I believe the cover letter says that she wanted to send a message to the members of the Legislature that she was not going to favor any more additions back to the special session cuts. I think the body...I, myself, know of nothing else that is working. I have nothing working myself, nor do any of the other three introducers, principal introducers of this bill. So because of those two reasons, she has never said that she is against adding back. In fact, the letter seems to indicate that she is in favor of this one proposal. I want to reiterate again that we have gone through a process. I would ask you to reconsider this veto and to override the veto.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Before recognizing Senators Wesely, Lamb and Rogers, the Chair announces that while the Legislature is in session and capable of transacting business, I propose to sign and I do sign engrossed LB 304 and engrossed LB 304A. Senator Wesely, please.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, members, we have debated this to great length. I'd like to just follow up on Senator Miller's comments and again encourage you to vote for the override and having worked through the compromise, worked through the committee, worked through the lengthy process on the floor, it would be terribly disappointing at this stage not to see that our efforts bear fruit. The question that has been raised about the 23 offices, whether they will close or not depending on this bill, is a legitimate question. The Governor states in her veto message that they will close no matter what we do. I would tend to disagree with that and argue that those offices have been identified as perhaps not being any cost saving in them because of the situation of donated space and et cetera, and I would argue that with the staff back in place that that situation ought to remain fluid. I would argue that by the passage of this bill and the understanding we've reached with that compromise, that no more than 23 offices would be closed. I think that is a clear situation from all of our discussions, but I would also argue that giving them the staff